

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2 and 5 are amended. Claims 9-20 are new. Claims 1, 5 and 15 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth hereinbelow.

**Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants have replaced the title with --ADJUSTABLE DISPLAY APPARATUS WITHIN AN AUTOMOBILE WITH MOVABLE OPERATING MEANS--. Applicants respectfully submit that the new title is descriptive and respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

The Examiner has further objected to the Abstract as failing to give adequate explanation of the invention. Also, the Examiner has required a substitute specification to be filed pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.125(a) because of improper idiomatic English. Applicants respectfully submit that a substitute specification is attached hereto, in which the Abstract has been revised to give adequate explanation and the specification has been amended to remove instances of improper idiomatic English. Applicants further submit that the amendments to the specification are editorial in nature and that no new matter has been added to the present application.

**Claim for Priority**

The Examiner has not recognized the Applicants' claim for foreign priority. In view of the fact that Applicants' claim for foreign priority has been perfected, the Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority in the next Office Action.

**Drawings**

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has accepted the Formal Drawings filed on December 19, 2001 for examination purposes. It is respectfully submitted that the formal drawings comply with the requirements of the USPTO. If the Official Draftsperson has any objections to the formal drawings, the Official Draftsperson is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned as soon as possible so that appropriate action may be taken.

**Acknowledgment of Information Disclosure Statement**

The Examiner has acknowledged the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 19, 2001. An initialed copy of the PTO-1449 has been received from the Examiner. No further action is necessary at this time.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that “the predetermined signal” in line 3 of claim 1 has insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that, in view of the above claim amendments, each feature recited in claim 1 now has sufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6, 008,986 to Mok (hereinafter “Mok”). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 now recites a mounted display means for displaying visual information and an operating means being rotatable on supporting means near the peripheral portion of the displaying means.

Mok discloses a laptop computer whose display panel 24 is connected via a hinge (like structure 54) to the computer housing 18. The keyboard 26 (interpreted by the Examiner as “operating means”) is housed within the housing 18, and may be elevated and slid forward with respect to this housing when the laptop is swung open.

As such, Mok fails to disclose a mounted (i.e., fixed) displaying means in combination with an operating means that is rotatable on a supporting means, as required by independent claim 1. Rather, when a laptop computer such as that disclosed in Mok is swung open, the housing 18 for the keyboard 26 remains fixed, while the display panel rotates to an open position. Accordingly, Mok fails to disclose each feature recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit claim 1 is allowable, at least for the reasons set forth above. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mok in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,949,643 to Batio (hereinafter "Batio"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Batio fails to remedy the deficiencies set forth above in connection with independent claim 1. Similar to Mok, Batio fails to disclose a fixed display panel connected to a rotatable operating means. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 6 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mok in view of Batio, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,222,507 to Gouko (hereinafter "Gouko"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action (pages 9-10), the Examiner admits that neither Mok nor Batio discloses changing a display scale depending on a size of display surface available. The Examiner relies upon Gouko to remedy this deficiency. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Gouko discloses display panels such that "an image displayed therein can become larger in size" (column 5, lines 37-45).

Applicants respectfully submit that Gouko neither teaches nor suggests changing a display scale during the operation of Gouko's device. Rather, in the portion of Gouko referred to by the Examiner, Gouko merely discloses that providing a separate display panel for each of a plurality of images can increase the size of each respective image with respect to the image size of prior art systems in which a plurality of images are displayed on one display panel.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no disclosure that the display device of Gouko changes the scale at which it displays an image. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Gouko fails to disclose or suggest changing a display scale based on a size of a display surface available, as required by independent claim 5. Since *prima facie* obviousness requires that all claimed features be taught or suggested by the prior art (see MPEP § 2143.03), Applicants submit that claim 5 is allowable over the cited prior art.

### **New Claims**

Applicants respectfully submit that new dependent claims 9-14 do not introduce new matter in the present application. For instance, claim 9 is fully supported by page 21, second full paragraph, in the specification. Claims 10-12 are supported by page 22, second full paragraph, and claim 13 is supported by Fig. 19 and the paragraph adjoining pages 18 and 19 in the specification. Claims 14-20 are supported by, *inter alia*, the originally-filed claims.

Applicants further respectfully submit that independent method claim 15 is allowable for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

### **Conclusion**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but to merely show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.


In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305), at the telephone number of the undersigned, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
D. Richard Anderson, #40,439

DR  
DRA/JWR/te  
1163-0380P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

Attachments: Substitute Specification, including an Abstract  
Marked-up Version